

1

2

3

4

5

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

9 || BRENT MORRIS,

Petitioner,

11 | VS.

12 | RENEE BAKER, *et al.*,

## 13 || Respondents.

Case No. 3:14-cv-00444-LRH-WGC

## ORDER

15 This action is a *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254  
16 by a Nevada state prisoner. In this action, petitioner challenges the loss of time credits resulting  
17 from the adjudication of prison disciplinary charges. Respondents have filed an answer to the  
18 petition. (ECF No. 11). On February 4, 2015, the Court directed petitioner to file a reply to the  
19 answer. (ECF No. 15). On May 11, 2015, the Court granted petitioner an extension of time to file a  
20 reply. (ECF No. 20).

Petitioner since has filed several motions for extensions of time to file a reply to the answer. (ECF Nos. 21, 22, 23, 24, 27). Petitioner contends that he has been unable to file a reply because boxes of his legal documents were confiscated by prison staff. (*Id.*). The confiscated materials apparently included Exhibits 1-31, which respondents filed in this action. (ECF Nos. 12-13). On January 25, 2016, respondents filed a response to petitioner's motion for an extension in which they indicate that they will mail another copy of the answer and exhibits to petitioner. (ECF No. 25, at p. 3). The proof of service attached to the response indicates that on January 25, 2016, respondents served petitioner with copies of the exhibits consisting of the state court record. (ECF No. 25, at p. 2).

1 4). However, in petitioner’s most recent motion for an extension, filed March 21, 2016, petitioner  
2 contends that, perhaps due to clerical error, he did not receive a copy of the answer and exhibits  
3 filed in this action when respondents sent him copies of documents from another case in January  
4 2016. (ECF No. 27, at p. 3). The Court directs respondents to serve petitioner with a copy of the  
5 answer and exhibits filed in the instant case. Good cause appearing, the Court grants petitioner’s  
6 motion for an extension of sixty additional days in which to file a reply to the answer.

7           **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that petitioner's motions for extension (ECF Nos. 21, 22,  
8 23, 24, 27) to file a reply to the answer are **GRANTED**.

9           **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, within **fifteen (15) days** from the date of entry of this  
10 order, respondents **SHALL SERVE** petitioner with a copy of the answer and all exhibits filed in the  
11 instant action.

12           **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, within **sixty (60)** days from the date of entry of this  
13 order, petitioner **SHALL FILE** a reply to the answer.

DATED this 31st day of March, 2016.

  
LARRY R. HICKS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE